DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 728 CS 003 944

AUTHOR Wurster, Stanley R.; Mathis, F. Austin, Jr.
TITLE Happiness Is: Reading.
INSTITUTION Glendale Elementary School District 40, Ariz.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 39p.; See related documents ED082150, ED101274, ED116131, and ED130255

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Oral Reading; *Parent Attitudes; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Reading Achievement; Reading Tests; *Remedial Reading Programs; Self Concept; Spanish Speaking; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the fifth year of a supportive reading program for educationally disadvantaged children in grades two, three, and four. Students were tested for improvement in oral reading, total reading, grade placement, self-concept, attitude, and attendance. In addition, the parents of participating children were surveyed for their reactions to the project. The report describes the program objectives and each of the evaluative measures involved; it then analyzes the results. While reading test scores reflect marked improvement, the project did not contribute significantly to student self-concept. Appendixes contain the student tests and results, the questionnaire in both Spanish and English that was used with the parents, and an analysis of parent reaction. (NAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151728

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

R E A D I N G R E S O U R C E C E N T E R

G L E N D A L E E L E M E N T A R Y S C H O O L D I S T R I C T #40

F I F T H Y E A R O F A T I T L E I P R O J E C T

HAPPINESS IS: READING

BY

Dr. Stanley R. Wurster, Evaluator

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

and

Mr. F. Austin Mathis, Jr., Director

GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT #40

Glendale, Arizona

October, 1977

CS003944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	Introduction	1
	Goals and Objectives	1
	Definition of Terms	2
II	Program Description	3
	Selection of Subjects	3
	Identifying Disadvantaged Children	4
	Reading Resource Centers	4
	Reading Achievement Measurement and Analysis	5
	Self Concept Measurement and Analysis	6
	Reading Attitude Measurement and Analysis	7
	Attendance Measurement and Analysis	7
	Parental Reaction Measurement and Analysis	8
III	Results	9
	Slosson Oral Reading Test	9
	Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests	10
	Self Concept Test	13
	Reading Attitude Inventory	14
	Attendance Records	15
	Parent Advisory Council Evaluation(PAC)	15
IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	18
Appendix		
	A. Slosson Oral Reading Test Results	19
	B. Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Results - Total Reading	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

	Page
C. Reading Attitude Inventory and Instructions	23
D. PAC Cover Letter and Evaluation Instrument	27
PAC Evaluation Instrument Analysis	33
E. Television Actors - Primary Level - Self Concept Inventory	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Actual and Predicted Post Test Mean Comparisons	13

Section I

Introduction

As early as 1965, the Glendale Elementary School District #40, became aware of apparent deficiencies in reading achievement among educationally disadvantaged children. In 1972, a supportive reading program was developed and implemented in an effort to improve the reading skills of educationally deprived children within the district. The results of the first four years of the ESEA Title I Reading program have been reported previously and appear in E.R.I.C. (Research In Education) under documents #ED082150, #ED101274, #ED116131 and #ED130255.

This report represents efforts to report the results of the fifth year of the supportive reading program as it functioned in the Glendale Elementary School District during the 1976-77 school year.

Goals and Objectives

The basic purpose of this Title I project was to improve the reading achievement of educationally disadvantaged students in grades two, three and four. Improvement was also anticipated in such areas of self concept, attitudes toward reading and attendance.

In pursuing the above mentioned goals the following objectives were established:

1. By May 30, 1977, eighty percent of the selected children will make a nine month or more gain in oral reading grade placement as measured by pre-post test results of the Slosson Oral Reading Test.
2. By May 30, 1977, eighty percent of the selected children will show at least a moderate improvement (.9 month gain) in "total reading" as measured by pre-post test results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

3. By May 30, 1977, the selected students will show an improvement in self concept as measured by pre-post test results of a self concept measure.
4. By May 30, 1977, the selected students will show an improvement in their attitude toward reading as measured by pre-post test results of a reading attitude inventory.
5. By May 30, 1977, attendance patterns for the selected children will improve during the present school year when compared to the prior school year.

In addition to the above objectives it was hoped that the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) or parents who had students participating in the Reading Resource Centers would have a positive reaction to the Reading Resource Centers as measured by a project developed survey instrument.

Definition of Terms

READING RESOURCE CENTERS:

This is the name given the seven instructional units formed to provide remedial reading instruction in the Glendale Elementary District. These Reading Centers are classrooms equipped and staffed for the teaching of reading.

EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN:

These are the children scoring in the 4th stanine or below on selected subtests of the Stanford Achievement Tests. These children are capable of benefitting from instruction and were recommended by their classroom teacher.

Section II

Program Description

In pursuing the objectives established for this project year, standardized tests were administered, responses to an attitude inventory were collected and prior and present year attendance figures were collected. In addition, parents' reactions to the project were sought. The data collected was analyzed in an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the project.

Selection of Subjects

Students selected to attend the Reading Resource Centers were selected by means of several criteria.

Scores were used from a district-wide achievement test given in the spring of 1976. The test used was the Stanford Achievement Test.

All students participating in the Reading Resource Centers had to score in the fourth stanine or below on selected subtests of the test and be recommended by their classroom teacher.

To qualify for the program, each of the target students had to have his/her parent's permission to participate. This was in an attempt to involve parents in motivating the children who would participate in the Centers. An attempt was also made to exclude students with disabilities and to deal with those children who were underachievers capable of increasing their reading achievement.

The Reading Resource Center reading specialists played a significant role in the screening and selection of participants during this fifth year of operation.

A total of 246 children participated in the project. This number included two first grade repeaters(.8%), 122 second graders(49.6%), 87 third graders(35.4%) and 35 fourth graders(14.2%). A total of eight of these program participants(3.3%) were non-public students.

The ethnic background of the participants was primarily Spanish surname(50.0%) and white(50.0%).

Identifying Disadvantaged Children

Based upon the numbers receiving aid for dependent children(80.0%), and free lunch-weighting(20.0%), approximately 1275 children from low income families were identified. The four schools with the highest percentage (over the district average of 17.0%) were selected as target schools for this ESEA Title I project.

The four schools selected with the highest concentration of children from low-income families were the Harold W. Smith School, Isaac E. Imes School, the Unit I School and the Glenn F. Burton School.

Using the criteria previously described, 260 educationally deprived children in the second, third, fourth and fifth grades were selected from the three target schools. A total of 246 children actually participated in the project.

Reading Resource Centers

Centers were set up as separate but cooperating units with one teacher and one educational assistant in each unit. Children attended the center one hour each day in groups of ten or less.

Each teacher had four instructional hours a day and all instruction was done on an individual basis or in small groups.

Educational Developmental Laboratories(EDL) materials "Listen, Look and Learn," were used as the central core for the program. Along with this program, use was made of the controlled reader, the look and write program, Tach-X recognition training, the Aud-X for word skills introduction and individual and small group reading. Reading Resource Center staff supplemented the EDL program to meet student needs recognized from previous experiences.

The EDL program was selected to serve as the core of instruction because:

a. A core-system had been found to be advantageous.

b. EDL is adaptable to many different areas and reading needs.

c. EDL could provide individualization in the program.

d. This program was totally different from the program used in the regular classroom.

The Reading Resource Centers were set up to deal with a child over a period of one year or more with stress placed upon the idea of success each day for the child.

The Reading Resource Centers' program was under the direction of one administrative director, with seven reading specialists and seven educational assistants manning the centers. Although each of the seven units used the same basic materials, each reflected the personalities of the individuals working there. Widespread use of positive reinforcement was noticeable in each of the seven centers.

Reading Achievement Measurement and Analysis

Two different instruments were used to measure reading achievement. Both the Slosson Oral Reading Test(SORT) and the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test were administered as pre and post test measures.

The SORT is a relatively short test designed specifically and totally for reading. It is individually administered. Three indicators of reading achievement are proved by this test; instructional level, independent level and frustration level. For purposes of this project only the instructional level (a grade equivalent) was used for evaluation.

The SORT was adminsitered in September, 1976, as a pre test to the target children only. It was again administered in May, 1977, to the target children as a post test.

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests were administered as a pre test in September, 1976, and were administered again as a post test in May, 1977. Subtest scores for reading: letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension,

paragraph comprehension and total reading were recorded and utilized in the final analysis.

For the Slosson Oral Reading Test, analysis was limited to calculated: mean, median, range and gains. Percentages and frequencies within reading gain classifications for individual grade levels were also calculated and analyzed relative to established objectives.

In an attempt to further evaluate the effectiveness of the Reading Resource Centers, the actual post test Reading Achievement scores of the students participating in the Reading Resource Centers were compared with an anticipated post test score based upon the child's normal growth pattern. This was done for each of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

Actual post test scores for the target students were compared to the anticipated post test scores by mean of correlated "t tests" to determine if there was any significant difference. All statistical tests were evaluated at the .05 level of significance.

Self-Concept Measurement and Analysis

A self-concept inventory was selected for the previous year's project and was used again this year. The inventory entitled, Television Actors-Primary Level, was administered in September, 1976, as a pretest and again in May, 1977, as a post test (See Appendix E).

This inventory asks the respondent to consider television roles which he would be willing to play in fictitious television show. Eighteen items are presented, some of which would be generally considered aversive, for example, a "dirty-faced child." The respondent's score is computed simply be determining the number of roles he would be willing to play.

This inventory is based upon the assumption that an individual who possess a positive self concept will be willing to project himself into a wider variety of roles than one who has a less strong self concept. One who is secure in aspects of his own identity can play a make-believe role without threat.

No criterion was established as to a desirable score on the eighteen item instrument. It was the purpose of this instrument to determine if the participants' self concept increased significantly from pretest to post test. Data was analyzed by means of a correlated t-test ($p \leq .05$).

Reading Attitude Measurement and Analysis

A reading attitude inventory was administered as a pretest and post test to determine the ability of the Reading Resource Centers to alter the target children's attitude toward reading (See Appendix C).

The attitude inventory utilized, subjected to extensive research previously, consisted of twenty statements related to reading. To add uniformity to the test administration, the test was administered by means of a cassette tape to students individually or to groups of students which did not exceed five (5).

Students responded to each of the twenty statements on the inventory by circling yes, maybe, or no. A rating scale ranging from 1 (no) to 3 (yes) was selected to designate attitudes as positive or negative. A score from 1 to 1.67 represented a negative attitude, a score from 1.675 to 2.34 represented an uncertain or neutral attitude and a score between 2.345 and 3.00 represent a positive attitude.

Means, medians and ranges were calculated for pre and post tests. Also, mean gain from pre to post test was determined. Mean attitude scores on pre and post tests were utilized for evaluation relative to the established objective. A correlated t-test was used to compare pre and post test means ($p \leq .05$).

Attendance Measurement and Analysis

Attendance patterns or children participating in the Reading Resource Centers was examined for the prior school year and the present school year in an effort to determine if attendance patterns changed for these children.

The total possible days of attendance for each school year was 176 days. The number of days a child attended each year was recorded for each child in the target group.

Means, medians and ranges for days attended during the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years were calculated as well as the mean gain/loss in days attended. The average number of days attended during these two school years was utilized for evaluation of the established objective. A correlated t-test was utilized to compare attendance patterns during the two school years ($p \leq .05$).

Parental Reaction to Reading Resource Centers Measurement and Analysis (PAC)

An eighteen item (18) survey instrument was developed by the project evaluator to solicit parental reactions to the Reading Resource Centers (See Appendix D). Parental involvement in evaluation was solicited by means of the Parent Advisory Council (PAC).

Responses to the eighteen items on the survey instrument were tabulated. Frequencies of responses within classifications (e.g. Yes, No, Uncertain) were recorded as well as percentages. Percentages of responses (e.g. Yes) were utilized for evaluation relative to the established objective.

The instrument was written in both English and Spanish.

Section III

Results

Various instruments were used and data collected in an effort to obtain meaningful information regarding the effectiveness and impact of the Title I Project-Reading Resource Centers. Used in this evaluation were:

Slosson Oral Reading Test

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests

a. Letter Identification

b. Word Identification

c. Word Attack

d. Word Comprehension

e. Paragraph Comprehension

f. Total Reading

Self Concept Test

Reading Attitude Inventory

Attendance Records (Previous and Present Years)

PAC Evaluation (Parental)

Slosson Oral Reading Test:

Analysis of the results of the SORT indicates the project was successful in exceeding objective one which stated:

Objective 1: By May 30, 1977, eighty percent of the selected children will make an eight month or more gain in reading grade placement as measured by pre-post test results of the SORT.

The average gain (9/76-5/77) in reading achievement for the total group of 212 participants for whom pre and post tests were available, was one year seven months (1.7). Eight (8) students from Our Lady of Perpetual Help realized an average gain of two years three months. Second graders (101), of the remaining (204) Glendale Elementary District students, realized an average gain of one year eight months; third graders (73)

realized an average of one year six months; and fourth graders (30), one year five months.

A sizeable percentage (86.3%) of the project participants made a nine month or more gain in reading grade level placement, and 88.2% made an eight month gain in reading grade level placement.

A total of 190 participants averaged one month or more gain in Reading Achievement for each month spent in the Reading Resource Centers. The figure represents 89.6% of the participants. A total of 12. participants or 57.1% averaged two months or more gain in reading achievements for each month spent in the Centers.

A more detailed break-down of students' average monthly gain per month in the project may be found in Appendix A.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests:

Results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests indicates the project was successful in exceeding objective two which stated:

> Objective 2: By May 30, 1977, eighty percent of the selected children will show at least a moderate improvement by pre-post test results of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests.

The adoption of the individually administered Woodcock Mastery Tests provides additional information relevant to the activities of the Centers. The Woodcock Tests provide information for evaluation in the areas of letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension, paragraph comprehension and total reading.

Data analysis relative to those skills indicated above yielded the following results:

> Letter Identification - average gain was 2 years 9 months
>
> Word Identification - average gain was 9 months
>
> Word Attack - average gain was 1 year 8 months

Word Comprehension - average gain was 9 months

Paragraph Comprehension - average gain was 1 year

Total Reading - average gain was 1 year 1 month

Eight(8) students from OLPH realized an average gain of one year on Total Reading. Second graders(101), of the remaining Glendale Elementary District students (204), realized an average gain of one year on Total Reading; second graders (109), one year one month, third graders (73), one year three months; and fourth graders (30), one year and three months.

A sizable percentage (83.5%) of the project participants (177) realized a gain of .9 month on total reading achievement for each month spent in the Reading Centers. A total of 164 participants or 77.4% made one(1) month gain for each month spent in the Reading Centers.

A more detailed break-down of student's average monthly gain per month in the project may be found in Appendix B.

A procedure started previously was utilized again this year in an effort to estimate the impact of the Reading Resource Centers on the achievement levels in those reading skill areas previously discussed. An anticipated post test score was based upon the child's normal growth pattern. For example, a student who is in the first month of third grade who pretests at 1.8 grade level (grade equivalent) has really shown a growth of eight months (most standardized tests start at 1.0) during his two years of school. Thus, he has shown a growth pattern of .4 month growth for each month in school while under the regular classroom program. Since this student would be exposed to the Reading Resource Center reading program for an eight month period (September - May), we would expect him to show a normal growth pattern of 3.2 months (8 x .4 = 3.2 months). Thus, we would expect his post test performance under a normal growth pattern to be three months above the pre test performance level or at 2.1 (1.8 + .3). This represents a predicted or anticipated post test score. The analysis performed was designed to answer the question, "Did the Reading Resouce Center reading program produce a significantly different post test performance

level than we might have expected under a normal growth pattern?" Also, "To what extent?"

In the areas of letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension, paragraph comprehension and total reading (all areas tested) the Reading Resource Center reading program produced results significantly better than we might have expected with a normal growth pattern.

The differences between the Reading Resource Center program impact and the normal growth pattern for these children was as follows:

Letter Identification - two years four months

Word Identification - four months

Word Attack - one year three months

Word Comprehension - five months

Paragraph Comprehension - five months

Total Reading - six months

These differences between the group predicted post test mean and the group predicted post test mean and the group actual post test mean was tested for significance with a correlated t-test ($p \leq .05$).

The results of the analysis procedures outlined above are presented in Table I on the next page:

TABLE I

ACTUAL AND PREDICTED POST TEST MEAN COMPARISONS

FOR THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TESTS

FOR TITLE I STUDENTS IN THE GLENDALE

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT (N = 212)

TEST	POST TEST MEAN (A) (PREDICTED)	STANDARD DEVIATION	POST TEST MEAN (ACTUAL)	STANDARD DEVIATION	DIFFERENCE	T - RATIO
LETTER IDENTIFICATION	2.4	2.4	6.1	4.1	2.2	9.098**
WORD IDENTIFICATION	2.6	.8	3.0	1.1	.4	9.601**
WORD ATTACK	2.7	1.3	4.0	2.7	1.3	9.155**
WORD COMPREHENSION	2.4	.9	2.9	.9	.5	7.889**
PARAGRAPH COMPREHENSION	2.7	.8	3.2	1.0	.5	12.423**
TOTAL READING	2.7	.9	3.3	1.0	.6	14.983**

(A) Numbers are expressed as grade equivalents.

* T - RATION REQUIRED AT .05 LEVEL WITH 211 = 1.960

** T - RATION REQUIRED AT .01 LEVEL WITH 211 = 2.576

In all cases the Title I intervention produced results significantly better than we might have expected with a normal growth pattern. These differences were significant beyond the .01 level of significance.

Self Concept Test:

Analysis of the results of the Television Actors self concept inventory indicates the project was not successful in reaching objective three which stated:

Objective 3: By May 30, 1977, the selected students will show an improvement in their self concept as measured by pre - post test results of a

self concept measure.

It was felt the test adopted was appropriate for these children and more sensitive to the measurement of self concept than previously used instruments. There was no criterion established as to a desirable score on the eighteen item instrument. It was the purpose of the instrument to determine if the participants' self concept increased significantly from pre test to post test.

Statistical analysis of the test results indicated that the pretest mean was 9.7 and the post test mean was 10.2. This difference was not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level ($t = 1.729$).

Reading Attitude Inventory

Results of the correlated t-test analysis indicate that the project was sucessful in reaching objective four which stated:

> Objective 4: By May 30, 1977, the selected students will show an improvement in their attitude toward reading as measured by pre-post test results of a reading attitude inventory.

In September 1977, the participant's attitude toward reading was found to be uncertain or neutral (2.28). Their attitude at time of post testing (5/77) was found to be positive (2.41), with a gain realized since the pretest.

Statistical analysis of the attitude test results indicated the difference between the pretest and post test was significant beyond the .01 level of significance ($t = 5.263$).

Attendance Records:

Analysis of the attendance records for participants for the school years 1975-76 and 1976-77 indicates the project was successful in reaching objective five which stated:

Objective 5: By May 30, 1977, attendance patterns for the selected children will improve during the present school year when compared to the prior school year.

To be included in the evaluation of attendance patterns a student must have attended the total years 1975-76 and 1975-77. There were 178 participants who fulfilled this criterion.

The mean number of days attended by project participants during the 1975-76 school year 164.3 days. The mean number of days attended by these 178 project participants during the 1976-77 school year was 166.9 days. The average gain in days attended between last year (1975-76) and this year (1976-77) was 2.6 days.

Statistical analysis of the 1975-76 and 1976-77 attendance results indicated that mean number of days attended by project participants during the 1976-77 school year was significantly improved over the 1975-76 school year ($p \leq .01$ - $t = 4.513$).

In addition to the above objectives data was collected from Parent Advisory Council (PAC) members and parents who had students participating in the Reading Resource Centers in an effort to assess their reactions to the Reading Resource Centers.

Parent Advisory Council Evaluation (PAC)

A total of eight(8) parents visited the Reading Resource Centers to observe the activities of the centers and to assist in evaluating these centers. A total of one parent observed in the Unit I Centers, two in the Imes School Centers, five in the Smith School Center and Zero at the Unit VII School Center.

A total of eight of those parents observing in the centers (100.0%) observed in centers attended by their children. Seven(7) of those parents (87.5%) completing the evaluation instrument indicated that they felt the Reading Resource Center program was a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children and should be used to benefit more children.

The overall indication of the responses to the Parent Evaluation Instrument was that parents are pleased with what is happening in the centers and to their children

and would like to see the program continued and even extended.

A more detailed anaylysis of the PAC evaluation instrument may be found in Appendix D. A copy of the English and Spanish versions of the evaluation instrument and cover letter may also be found in Appendix D.

Section IV

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

In view of the results, the following conclusions are advanced:

1. The Reading Resource Centers have been successful and contributed towards the improvement of oral reading grade level placement for the target students as measured by the Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT).
2. Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Analysis suggest that the Reading Resource Centers have had considerable impact upon target students' reading skills. This impact is evident specifically in the areas of:
    a. Letter Identification
    b. Word Identification
    c. Word Attack
    d. Word Comprehension
    e. Paragraph Comprehension
    f. Total Reading
3. The Title I project did not contribute to a significant improvement in self concept during the project year.
4. The Reading Resource Centers have contributed to the improvement of target students' attitude toward reading.
5. Attendance patterns of target students have improved during this project year and the Title I project has contributed to this improved attendance pattern.
6. Parents with children involved in the Reading Resource Center program are pleased with the program and feel the program is a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children and should be used to benefit more children.

Recommendations

In view of the findings of this report, the following recommendations are offered:

1. It is recommended that the Reading Resource Center program be continued as it is presently functioning. In this manner children will continue to receive the obvious benefits of the program.
2. It is recommended that efforts exerted during this project year to involve parents in program evaluation be continued and expanded where possible during the next project year.
3. It is recommended that efforts to modify students' self concept be renewed. Those activities utilized during the previous project year specifically designed to enhance self concept need to be reevaluated and perhaps reinstituted during the new project year. New approaches might also be tried during the new project year and evaluated for continued use in future years.

APPENDIX A

Slosson Oral Reading Test Results

GRADE LEVELS	STUDENTS' AVERAGE MONTHLY GAIN PER MONTH IN THE PROJECT SLOSSON ORAL READING TEST (Reported in Grade Equivalent Months or Fractions of Months)												TOTAL STUDENTS
	Less Than .0 (No Gain)		.0 to .4 Month		.5 to .9 Month		1.0 to 1.4 Month		1.5 to 1.9 Month		2.0 or More Months		With Pretest and Post Test Scores
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2	0	0.0	4	3.9	8	7.7	12	11.5	12	11.5	68	65.4	104
3	0	0.0	3	4.0	4	5.3	13	17.1	19	25.0	37	48.7	76
4	0	0.0	1	3.1	2	6.3	7	21.9	6	18.8	16	50.0	32
TOTAL	0	0.0	8	3.8	14	6.6	32	15.1	37	17.5	121	57.1	212

APPENDIX B

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Results
Total Reading

GRADE LEVELS	STUDENTS' AVERAGE MONTHLY GAIN PER MONTH IN THE PROJECT WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST-TOTAL READING (Reported in Grade Equivalent Months or Fractions of Months)												TOTAL STUDENTS
	Less Than .0 (No Gain)		.0 .4 Month		.5 to .9 Month		1.0 to 1.4 Month		2.0 or 1.9 Month		2.0 or More Months		With Pretest and Post Test Scores
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2	0	0.0	4	3.9	24	23.1	33	31.7	26	25.0	17	16.4	104
3	0	0.0	1	1.3	10	13.3	21	27.6	24	31.6	20	26.3	76
4	0	0.0	1	3.1	8	25.0	8	25.0	8	25.0	7	21.9	32
TOTAL	0	0.0	6	2.8	42	19.8	62	29.3	58	27.4	44	20.8	212

Appendix C

INSTRUCTIONS
(ON TAPE)

Reading Attitude Inventory and Instructions

READING ATTITUDE INVENTORY

We are now ready to begin a reading game. All you have to do is answer the questions. There is a person there who will stop the tape recorder if you have a problem. Be sure you understand each thing I say before I go on.

This is a reading game to find out how boys and girls feel about reading. So that you really understand what is meant by feeling, let's talk about another kind of feeling. Most boys and girls like to watch T.V.. Some programs you like better than others. How you feel is your attitude.

I want you to be very honest and tell me how you really feel about reading. Don't answer how you think your mom or dad or someone else wants you to answer. I want you to tell me how the statement makes you feel inside yourself.

Let's look at the Answer Sheet. There are three ways to mark the answers. You will have to know what they mean, so listen carefully.

Mark "YES" if you agree with the statement.

Mark "NO" if you do not agree with the statement.

Mark "MAYBE" if you do not really know if you agree or if you do not agree.

I will read each example two times. Do not mark an answer until you have heard it both times. Listen to Example A. I like to read. I like to read. Mark an answer. How do you feel about that statement? If you like to read books, you marked YES. If you do not like to read books, you marked NO. If you were unsure, whether you like to read books or do not like to read books, you marked MAYBE. Do you understand?

Let's try another one. Listen to Example B. You learn more from T.V. than from reading books. You learn more from T.V. than from reading books. Mark an answer. If you think you learn more from T.V. than from reading books, you marked YES. If you think you do not learn more from T.V. than from reading books, you marked NO. If

you were not sure whether reading is a better way to spend time or watching T.V. is a better way to spend time, you marked MAYBE. Do you understand?

If you do not understand how to score the answers, the tester will stop the tape and explain again. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. It's just how you feel about it. We are ready to start.

I will read each statement two times. Do not mark your answers until you have heard it both times. Number 1.....

READING ATTITUDE TEST

1. Reading is fun.
2. There is nothing to be learned from reading books.
3. Money spent on books is wasted.
4. Books are boring.
5. Reading is a good way to spend free time.
6. Sharing books is a waste of time.
7. You should only read books if you want to make good grades.
8. Reading is important to me.
9. Books are usually good enough to finish reading.
10. There should be more time for free time reading in school.
11. Reading is for learning, but not for fun.
12. Reading is something I don't need.
13. There are many books which I would like to read.
14. Most books are not interesting.
15. Reading is not a good way to spend free time.
16. You should spend sometime reading during your summer vacation.
17. You don't learn anything reading in your free time.
18. You should read books only in school.
19. Books make good presents or gifts.
20. Reading is something I can use.

Glendale Elementary Schools

DISTRICT No. 40
5734 W. GLENDALE AVENUE
GLENDALE, ARIZONA 85301

PAC Cover Letters and Evaluation Instruments
PAC Evaluation Instrument Analysis

Title I - Reading Resource Centers

Dear Parents:

We would sincerely welcome your participation in the Glendale Elementary School District Title I Project and thank you for taking time to aid us in evaluating our program and Reading Centers.

When you enter the school, please report to the principal's office and his secretary will assist you in locating the Reading Center. Let them know you are there to assist in the evaluation of the Reading Center - Title I Project.

Enclosed you will find a "Parent Evaluation" form designed to assist you. Complete it during the time you are in the Reading Center. At the conclusion of your visit ask the teacher for an envelope and seal it. You may leave it in the "Center" and the school will mail it to Dr. Kennedy.

We would like to encourage parents to visit in more than one Reading Center. The schedule enclosed will help you know the time of day children are in the Reading Centers. Each center has a supply of "Parent Evaluation" forms like the one enclosed. Please use one for each center you visit. If added room is needed for "comments" please use the reverse side.

Richard Shepherd
Mr. Richard Shepherd
Parent Advisory Council President

Dr Stanley Warster
Dr. Stanley R. Warster
Title I Evaluator

Estimados Padres:

Les invitamos sinceramente su participación en el proyecto Título I de las Escuelas Elemental Glendale y les agradecemos el tiempo que van a tomar para ayudarnos en la evaluación de nuestro programa (Centros de Lectura).

Quando pasen a la escuela, hagan el favór de presentarse en la oficina del director y la secretaria les ofrecerá asistencia en encontrár el Centro de lectura. Digan que se presentan para ayudar en la evaluacion de los Centros de Lectura (Proyecto Título I).

Incluida con esta carta se encuentra una forma titulada "Parent Evaluation". Esta forma fúe hecha con la intención de ayudarles en la evaluación. Hagan el favor de completar la informacion necesaria durante el tiempo que se encuentren en el Centro de Lectura. Al concluir la visita hagan el favor de pedirle a la maestra un sobre e incluyan la evaluación en el sobre y hagan el favor de cerrar el sobre. Pueden dejar el sobre en el Centro de Lectura y la escuela se encargarará de enviarsela a Dr. Kennedy.

Se es posible, hagan el favor de visitar Centros de Lectura adicionales. El horario incluido le ayudará saber los tiempos del dia durante cuando se encontraran niños(as) en las Clases de Lectura. En cada Centro encontrarán formas favor de usar una forma para cada uno de los Centros que visiten. Si desean comentár, hagan el favor de usar el otro lado de esta forma.

APPENDIX D
(ENGLISH)

Glendale Elementary Schools
ESEA Title I - Reading Resource Centers
Parent Evaluation

Date: _____

Parent observed Reading Centers in:
(check which school)

☐ Unit I School ☐ Harold Smith School

☐ Isaac Imes School ☐ Unit VII School

Does your child attend this center?

Yes_____ No_____

The goal of our Reading Centers and Title I project is to improve the reading performance for educationally disadvantaged children. Our objectives are designed to attain this goal. Please record your observations and reactions the best you can, and when necessary ask questions of the adults working in the centers.

1. How many adults did you find in the center working with the children?

   0_____ 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ more than 3_____

2. Did you find the children working in small groups on different reading skills? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

   Comments:

3. Children in the Centers advance in their reading lessons at their own speed. Do you feel that this is motivation and beneficial to the children? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

   Comments:

4. Did you find that as the children worked on their different reading skills, that the equipment they were using played an important part in their learning progress? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

   Comments:

5. Do you feel the children were motivated to work on their reading skills by using the equipment found in the Reading Center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

6. Did you find the children in the center receiving individual attention from the adults in the center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

7. Did you find that the children were busy during the period while they were in the center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

8. Did you find the children using materials which appeared to be aiding the children in their reading skills? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

9. Did you find that the children enjoyed the various activities in which they were involved? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

10. Did you find the atmosphere of the reading centers friendly, warm, and generally pleasant for the children? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

11. Did you find that the children appear to take pride in their work and accomplishments in the Reading Center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

12. Did you find that the child's success was constantly encouraged by the adults in the Reading Center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

13. Did you find that the children were eager to ask for help when they needed it? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

14. Did you find that the adults in the center worked well with the children? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

15. Did you find that the children knew what their tasks were and when necessary worked at these tasks independently or without being assisted by the adults in the center? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

16. Did the children appear to be anxious to come to the center and somewhat reluctant to leave? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

17. In general, do you feel that the procedures and type of student participation found in the Reading Center increases and strengthens student-teacher relationships? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:

18. Would you give your overall reaction to the Reading Center by choosing one of the following:

_____(a) A beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, and should be used to benefit more children.

_____(b) A beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children, but which should be restricted to a limited number of children with severe reading problems.

_____(c) A program with limited benefits to children in our district, and in need of major revision.

_____(d) A program which offers little or no opportunity for children to improve their basic reading skills, and should be abandoned.

_____(e) Other (Please comment) -

Comment:

APPENDIX D
(ESPANOL)

Escuelas de Glendale Elemental
ESEA Title I - Centros de Leer
Evaluacion de Padres

Fecha: _____

Padre observo Centros de leer en:

☐ Unit I School ☐ Harold Smith School ☐ Glenn F. Burton School

☐ Isaac Imes School ☐ William C. Jack School

¿Su niño(a) asiste a este centro?

Si _____ No _____

El motivo de nuestros Centros de Leer y el Projecto Title I es mejorar el método de leer de los niños que son desventajados en la educación. Nuestros objetivos son intentoados a obtener este motivo. Por favor indique sus observaciones y reacciones lo mejor que pueda; y cuando necesario haga preguntas de los adultos trabajando en los centros.

1. ¿Cuantos adultos vió Ud. en el centro trabajando con los niños?

   0_____ 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ mas de 3 _____

2. ¿Notó Ud. los ninos trabajando en grupos pequenos en diferentes ejercicios de leer? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a) comentario:

3. Los niños en los centros avanzan ensus lecciones de leer a su velocidad. ¿Piensa Ud. que este es un modo de propia motivar y que es benficial para los niños? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a) _____

   Comentario:

4. ¿Notó Ud. que mientras los ninos trabajaban en sus diferentes ejercicios de leer que el equipo que usaban fue una parte importante en su progreso de aprender? Si_____ No_____ No estoy sequro(a)_____

   Comentario:

5. ¿Piensa Ud. que los niños fueron motivados a trabajar en sus ejercicios de leer usando el equipo en el centro de leer? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy serguro(a)_____ Comentario:

6. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños en el centro recibían atención de los adultos en el centro? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

7. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños estaban ocupados durante el periodo mientras Ud. estaba en el centro? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

8. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños usaban materiales que paracían ayudar a los niños en sus ejercicios de leer? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

9. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños se divertían con las actividades en que participaban? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

10. ¿Notó Ud. que las atmosfera del centro de leer fue amistosa, y en general alegre para los niños? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

11. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños aparecian tomar orgullo en su trabajo y en lo que completaron en el centro de leer? Sí_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____
Comentario:

12. ¿Notó Ud. que los resultados buenos fueron animidos por los adultos en el Centro de leer? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____

Comentario:

13. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños fueron ansiosos para hacer preguntas cuando necesitaban ayuda? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____

Comentario:

14. ¿Notó Ud. que los adultos en el centro trabajaban bien con los niños? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____

Comentario:

15. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños sabían lo que tenían que hacer y cuando necesario trabajaban independientemente o sin asistencia de los adultos en el centro? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____

Comentario:

16. ¿Notó Ud. que los niños aparecían ansiosos venir al centro y no quererse ir? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____

Comentario:

17. ¿En general, piensa used que los modos y el tipo de participación de los estudiantes quienes se encuentran en los centros de lectura aumenta y mejora las relaciones entre los estudiantes y las maestras? Si_____ No_____ No estoy seguro(a)_____ Comentario:

18. Haga el favor de indicar su reaccion tocante el centro de lectura. Escoja una de las siguientes:

_____(a) Un programa beneficial para los estudiantes que cumple con las necesidades basicas de la lectura y que se deberia de usar para mas niños(as).

_____(b) Un programa beneficial para los estudiantes que cumple con las necesidades basicas de la lectura pero que se deberia de usar solamente para el beneficio de estudiantes quienes tienen problemas serios con la lectura.

_____(c) Un programa con pocos beneficios para los estudiantes del distrito y que necesita revisos mayores.

_____(d) Un programa que ofrece poca y ninguna oportunidad para que estudiantes mejoren su lectura y que deberia ser abandonado.

_____(e) Otro (haga el favor de comentar)

Comentario:

APPENDIX D

PARENT EVALUATION

A total of eight (8) parents visited the Reading Resource Centers to observe the activities of the centers and to assist in evaluating these centers. A total of one (1) parent observed in the Unit I School centers, two (2) in the Imes School centers, five (5) in the Smith School center and zero (0) in the Unit VII School center.

The overall indication of the responses to the parent evaluation instrument was that these parents were pleased with what they saw happening in the centers and to their children. It was also indicated that what they saw happening greatly enhances the possibility of the project reaching its objectives.

A total of eight (8) of those parents observing in the centers (100.0%) were observing in centers which their children attended.

Four (4) parents (50.0%) reported that they found three adults in the centers working with children. Four (4) or (50.0%) reported finding two (2) adults in the centers working with the children.

All eight (8) respondents (100.0%) reported that:

1. Children were working in small groups on different reading skills.
2. They felt the children working in their reading lessons at their own speed served as motivation and was beneficial to the children.
3. They found children using equipment which played an important part in their learning progress.
4. The children were motivated to work on their reading skills by using the equipment found in the Reading Center.
5. They found children receiving attention from the adults in the center.
6. They found the children were busy during the period they were in the center.
7. They found children using materials which appeared to be aiding the children in their reading skills.

8. Children enjoyed the various activities in which they were involved.

9. The atmosphere of the reading centers was friendly, warm and generally pleasant for the children.

10. Children appear to take pride in their work and accomplishments in the Reading Center.

11. They felt that the child's success was constantly encouraged by adults in the Reading Centers.

12. The children were eager to ask for help when they needed it.

13. The adults in the center worked well with the children.

14. The children knew what their tasks were and when necessary worked at these tasks independently or without being assisted by the adults in the center.

15. The children appeared to be anxious to come to the center and somewhat reluctant to leave.

16. The procedures and type of student participation found in the Reading Center increases and strenghtens student-teacher relationships.

A total of seven (7) respondents (87.5%) reported that:

17. The Reading Resource Centers is a beneficial program which is fulfilling basic reading needs of children and should be used to benefit more children.

Comments written on the evaluation instruments reinforced the indication that parents were generally very pleased with the Reading Resource Center program and felt it should be continued and even extended.

Appendix E

TELEVISION ACTORS

Television Actors
Primary Level
Self Concept Inventory

DIRECTIONS (To be read aloud)

Let's pretend we are going to put on a television show. If you will play the part I ask you, mark "yes" on your answer sheet. If you will not play the part I ask you, mark "no" on your answer sheet. You may play as many parts as you wish.

(Use practice items as needed for class to understand procedure.)

1. Will you play the part of a barnyard animal?
2. Will you play the part of a tree that talks?
3. Will you play the part of an angel?
4. Will you play the part of Batman? (Current is Six Million Dollar Man)
5. Will you play the part of a cry baby?
6. Will you play the part of a lonely child?
7. Will you play the part of the Pied Piper?
8. Will you play the part of a forest ranger?
9. Will you play the part of a mushroom?
10. Will you play the part of a worm?
11. Will you play the part of an airplane pilot?
12. Will you play the part of a bunny?
13. Will you play the part of a fireman?
14. Will you play the part of a slow-poke?
15. Will you play the part of a baby?
16. Will you play the part of a policeman?
17. Will you play the part of a hurt child?
18. Will you play the part of a butterfly?